U.S.S.N. 10/634,850

Remarks

The applicant thanks the Examiner Giles for the prudential examination.

Response to the objection to "the window"

With respect to the Examiner's objection to the term "the window", the applicant has amended claims 20, 23 and 26 accordingly. It is believed that the amended claims 20, 23 and 26 have overcome the objection.

Response to the Rejection under 35 USC 112

With respect to the Examiner's rejection that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification ("the second window"), the applicant respectfully points out that the specification has described checking multiple pixels (sequentially), and therefore there have to be multiple windows corresponding to the multiple pixels, even if this is not specifically stressed in the specification. See, e.g., page 4, lines 25-26; page 6, lines 25-27.

9

U.S.S.N. 10/634,850

Response to the Rejection under 35 USC 103

With respect to the Examiner's rejection based on Reinhart, the applicant respectfully points out that in the present invention, a pixel is checked to determine whether or not it is defective, before the next pixel is checked. See page 6, lines 25-27 of the specification:

> "*In step 53, if the pixel is identified as a peak, the pixel is further checked to determine whether it is defective before checking the next pixel in the row.*"

In this way, a defect is instantly identified. This provides the merit that the memory does not have to store one-bit indicator information of all the pixels. It only needs to store the ones that are required for determining whether another pixel is a peak. Others can be discarded.

More specifically, as an example, please refer to Fig. 2 of the present invention. Assuming the peak and defect checking is processed sequentially from (0, 0), (0, 1) to (F, F), and

10

U.S.S.N. 10/634,850

currently it is on the pixel (5, 6) (wherein 5 is the vertical

coordinate and 6 is the horizontal coordinate). Thus, the one-

bit indicators of pixels from (0, 0) to (4, 1) are no longer

useful; they will not be in the windows of the pixels from (5, 6)

to (F, F). Hence, the memory space occupied by these indicators

can be released.

On the other hand, in Reinhart, as indicated by its Fig. 5

and description in lines 23-32 of column 4, it stores the

information of all the "outliers", and then determines all the

bad pixels. Thus, Reinhart does not provide the merit as the

present invention does.

To distinguish the present invention over Reinhart, the

applicant has amended claims 19, 22 and 25 by inserting the

following wording: "*confirming whether it is a defect, before

determining whether a pixel next to the first pixel is a peak*".

As such, the currently pending claims are believed

allowable over Reinhart. Such favorable action by the Examiner

is respectfully solicited.

11

U.S.S.N. 10/634,850

In the event that the present invention as claimed is not in condition for allowance for any reason, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicant's representative at his Bloomfield Hills, Michigan office at (248) 540-4040 such that necessary action may be taken to place the application in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Tung & Associates

Randy W. Tung
Reg. No. 31,311
Telephone: (248) 540-4040

12